DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 471 UD 028 225

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Analysis of the Core Planning Teams of Project CANAL--Year 1 (1988-1989).
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 69p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgets; Community Control; Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Participant Characteristics; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This first-year evaluation analyzes the composition and participation of the core planning teams of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan to reduce inequities in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools in Chicago (Illinois). CANAL's goal is to organize and train core planning teams, the representative bodies of the school community, to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The teams were to be composed of parents, teachers, principals, ancillary school staff, and community members. The following findings are presented: (1) some teams were too small to be representative and some were too large to be effective; (2) the methods for composing teams varied widely; (3) teachers dominated the memberships; (4) ancillary staff, community members, and parents were dramatically underrepresented on the teams; (4) 24 percent of the team members, including about half of the ancillaries, parents, and community members, failed to attend the orientation sessions; (5) 25 percent of the team members failed to attend the first of the school-based management (SBM) training sessions; (6) 28 percent of the team members, including 75 percent of the community members, failed to attend the second of the SBM training sessions; and (9) there were further declines in the attendance of nonteaching team members in the total site training. Statistical data are presented in 16 tables. A budget is appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336471

UD

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

YEAR-END PROGRESS REPORT OF MONITORING PROJECT CANAL YEAR 1 (1988-89)

(An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of the Core Planning Teams)

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

January 1990

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lee Hess-Oslaga
Monitoring Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 028 215

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin
Helen Jackson
Barb Leebens-Osilaja
Christy Spears
Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTACT PERSON:
Helen Jackson
(312) 890-8220

January 1990

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's

ANALYSIS OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS OF PROJECT CANAL - YEAR 1 (1988-1989)

The year-end progress report of the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation analyzed the composition and participation of core planning teams during Year 1 (September 1988 through August 1989) of Project CANAL, a five-year program in the Chicago Public Schools developed with monies from the $83 million Settlement Fund.

The findings:

o **CORE PLANNING TEAM COMPOSITION**

- Teams ranged in size from as small as 11 to as large as 45.
- Some teams were too small to represent the constituencies specified in the CANAL proposal.
- Some were too large to function effectively as teams.
- The methods for composing the teams varied widely.
- Teachers dominated the memberships of the core teams.
- Ancillary staff, community members and parents were dramatically underrepresented.

o **PARTICIPATION IN ORIENTATION SESSIONS**

- 24 percent of the team members failed to attend Orientation.
- About half of the ancillaries, parents, and community members failed to attend.
- More than 90 percent of the teachers and principals attended.
- Given the importance of the core planning team to the success of CANAL, the high rate of absenteeism was unfortunate and did not signal a good start to CANAL.

- **PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TRAINING - DAY 1**
  - 25 percent of the team members failed to attend.
  - Parent and ancillary participation improved slightly.
  - Community member participation declined to 42 percent.
  - Principals and teachers all attended (100 percent).
- **PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TRAINING - DAY 2**
  - 28 percent of the team members failed to attend.
  - About one half of the ancillaries and parents, and 75 percent of the community members were absent.
  - The attendance of teachers and principals declined to somewhat less than 95 percent.
- **PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING**
  - There were further declines in non-teaching core planning team members.
  - 45 of 46 training sessions had no community representative present.
  - 32 of 46 training sessions had fewer than 4 parents present.
  - 21 of the 46 training sessions had fewer than the required 3 ancillary members present.

Basic flaws in both the composition and participation of the core planning teams deny the possibility of assessing whether changes in achievement can be attributed to CANAL. Based on the analysis of the implementation of the core planning teams, CANAL clearly failed to meet the requirements of the proposal. Team members consisted primarily of teachers and principals, while ancillaries, parents, and community members only played a peripheral role.

The 59-page year-end progress report was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator, and primary consultant, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz. It has been submitted to the United States Department of Education. Reference copies are available at the Monitoring Commission office, 1918 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

YEAR-END PROGRESS REPORT OF MONITORING PROJECT CANAL YEAR 1 (1988-89)

(An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams)

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant

January 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

PREFACE

This is the third progress report done by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation to satisfy requirements of the $83 million Settlement Fund proposal. This report, written for the United States Department of Education, is the year-end progress report of monitoring Project CANAL: Year 1 - an analysis of the composition and participation of core planning teams.

The analysis was done under the direction of myself and the primary consultant, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz. On-site monitoring was done by Monitoring Commission staff personnel, Regina Horton, Barb Leebens-Osilaja, Jesse Qualls and Christy Spears. Other Commission staff who assisted in this report include Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

January 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS 3

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION. 13

SCHOOL-BASE MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1
ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS. 22

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2
ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS. 31

TOTAL SITE TRAINING
ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS. 37

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION DURING YEAR 1 49

APPENDIX 57

LIST OF TABLES

Composition of CPTs

Page

Table 1 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1 5

Table 2 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1
Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members 9

Table 3 - Methods for Recruiting Core Planning Team Members 11

CPT Attendance at Orientation

Table 4 - Participation in Orientation Training:
40 Core Planning Teams
School and Category of Participant. 16

Table 5 - Orientation Training: Attendance of the
40 Core Planning Teams
Representation of Key Constituencies 19

Table 6 - Attendance of 40 Core Planning Teams at Orientation
Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members. 20

Core Planning Team Attendance at Day 1 of SBM

Table 7 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making: Day 1
40 Core Planning Teams: School and Category of Participant 25

Table 8 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making: Day 1
Presentation of Key Constituencies of the 40 Teams 28

Table 9 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making: Day 1
Representation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and
Community Members on the 40 Core Teams. 30

Table 10 - Comparison of 40 Core Teams
Membership and Attendance at Orientation and Day 1 Training
Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members 32

Core Planning Attendance at Day 2 of SBM

Table 11 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared Decision Making: Day 2 40 Core Planning Teams: School and Category of Participation . . . 35

Table 12 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Day 2 Representation of Key Constituencies of the 40 Teams 38

Table 13 - Participation in School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Day 2 Presentation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members on the 40 Core Teams 40

Total Site Training Attendance of CPTs

Table 14 - Participation in Total Site Training 35 Core Planning Teams: School and Category of Participants 43

Table 15 - Participation in Total Site Training: Representation of Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members in the 46 Sessions 50

Table 16 - Comparisons of the Attendance of the Core Planning Teams: Year 1 Membership, Orientation, Day 1, Day 2, and Total Site 52

INTRODUCTION

The following is an analysis, by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation staff, of the composition and participation of core planning teams in the Project CANAL. Core planning teams are a key ingredient in Project CANAL's model for improving education. CANAL was predicated on the assumption that the best way to raise the academic achievement of minority students in racially identifiable schools was to develop a model for school governance at the local school level that included the support and participation of the key stakeholders in the educational system.

Based on the concepts of school-based management and shared decision-making, Project CANAL proposed to organize core planning teams at each participating school consisting of various school and community representatives. The core planning team, a nucleus of constituents in each school, would lead the way in developing and implementing a school improvement plan to raise of academic achievement levels. More specifically, the Settlement Fund Proposal described the role of core planning team as follows:

> Each participating school will form a core planning team that will be responsible for developing, managing, implementing, and evaluating a school improvement plan designed to meet the specific educational needs of their students. The core planning team will be responsible for utilizing the principles of school based management and shared governance to facilitate activities that will make the school improvement plan a reality.[1]

---

[1] Creating A New Approach To Learning, Settlement Fund Proposal, Approved April 13, 1988, Board Reports 88-0413-RS1 and 88-0413-ED1, p. 2.

The importance of core planning team as a representative body of the school community was captured in the following Proposal description:

> Members of core planning team will be responsible for reporting to and receiving recommendations from the groups they represent during each phase of the school improvement plan to insure that every segment of the school population takes an active part in creating a school environment that provides an opportunity for students to maximize their potential.[2]

The first year of Project CANAL focused on selecting the schools to participate, organizing core planning teams, and training them to initiate school-based management and shared governance in the schools they represented. The major product of core planning teams by the end of the first year was the development of a school improvement plan, detailing specific improvements to increase the quality of education in the local school.[3]

Given that core planning teams represented the essence of the CANAL concept, the Monitoring Commission evaluated the extent to which the CANAL staff were able to implement these teams. This report's purpose is to provide an assessment of the extent to which Project CANAL was successful in organizing and training core planning teams as detailed in the CANAL proposal.

The specific activities of CANAL reported here include: the composition of the core planning teams and their participation in the training that Project CANAL provided to prepare the teams to meet their obligations. The training activities they were to attend during the first year of CANAL included: Orientation training, School-Based

---

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

[3] A review of the school improvement plans that were developed is provided in the Monitoring Commission's report: Analysis of the Level of Compliance of Project CANAL's School Improvement Plans 1989-90, February 1990.

Management/Shared Decision-making training: Day 1, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-making training: Day 2 and Total Site training.

The Monitoring Commission believes that the potential of the CANAL concept, and more particularly, the possibility of developing working models of school-based management and shared governance within the CANAL schools depends on the extent to which CANAL can organize and train core planning teams. This position is consistent with the rationale used in CANAL proposal acquire the Settlement Funds.

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS

The concept of school-based management was organized around the assumption that an effective educational environment is one in which all key actors participate in the management of the school. According to the CANAL proposal, the key actors include representatives of the school's faculty and administration, ancillary school staff, students, parents, community members and other groups that may have a positive influence on the educational environment. The core planning team was to lead the way in developing a model for school improvement in order to increase levels of academic achievement. The Settlement Fund proposal described the composition of core planning teams as follows:

> The members of core planning team will include representatives of the significant groups of each school community: the principal; at least one teacher from each grade level (or department chairpersons in high schools); at least three ancillary staff representatives (including clerks, teacher aides, school aides, engineers, lunchroom managers, and others); a minimum of five parents and two community group representatives from the Local

School Improvement Council (LSIC); and Student Council representatives may be included in high schools.[4]

As evidenced by the quotation above, the funded proposal specified about the composition of core planning teams and did not leave the matter to the discretion of individual schools or program staff. Table 1 displays the actual composition of the 41 core planning teams for the first year of CANAL.[5] The table shows the number of members representing the various constituencies for each school. The last column of the table provides the total number of members on the core planning team of each school.

The table reveals great variation in the number of persons on a team with one team, ranging from 11 members to as many as 45. Some variation was expected in that the enrollments of schools as well as the number of grades in schools differ. Most of the schools, 16, had between 21 and 25 members on the team. Another 10 schools had between 16 and 20 members, while nine had 26 to 30 members. At the extreme ends, one team had only 11 and another only 14 members while three had more than 30 members, 32, 34 and 36, and one had as many as 45 members.

The size of the teams is significant; they had to be large enough to provide adequate representation of the relevant constituencies, but not so large as to be an unwieldy working group. While there is considerable literature on size and effectiveness of groups, the size of the core planning teams received little formal attention in the CANAL proposal beyond the quotation above, which was concerned primarily with

---

[4] Creating A New Approach To Learning, Settlement Fund Proposal, Approved April 13, 1988, Board Reports 88-0413-RS1 and 88-0413-ED1, p. 2.

[5] Data on the composition of core teams was provided to the Monitoring Commission by CANAL staff.

Table 1

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1*

School	P	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	TOTAL
Bass	1	11	1	1	1	1		9	1	26
Bennett	1	11	1	1	1			6	1	22
Bradwell	1	11		1	2	2	2	7	1	27
Byford	1	11	1	1		1		3		18
Carter	1	12	1	1	1	2	1	9		28
Clark	1	10	1	1	1	1		5	2	22
Cooper	1	6	1	1	1	2		3	2	17
DePriest	1	10	1	1	1	1	1		5	21
Dett	1	6	1	1	1			4		14
DuBois	1	14	1	1	1	1		2	1	22
Dumas	1	14	1	1	1	1		5	1	25
DuSable	1	33								34
Dyett	1	14	1	1	1	1		5	1	25
Fernwood	1	9	1	1	1	2		5		20
Frazier	1	14	1	1		1	1	5	2	26
Gale	1	16	1	1	1	1		3		24
Goldblatt	1	13	1	1	1	1		2	2	22
Gregory	1	8	1	1	1	1		7		20
Guggenheim	1	9	1	1	1	1		5		19
Hammond	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	6		22
Hearst	1	9	1	1	1	3	1	4	1	22
Howe	1	16	1	1	1	1	2	5		28
Hughes	1	11	1	1	1	1		2	1	19
Jungman**	1	9					1	5	1	17
Kelvyn Park	1	13	1	1	1	1	1	8	3	30
Lafayette	1	15	1	1		1		6	1	26
Lowell	1	13	1	1	1	1	1	7		26
Manierre	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	7	3	21
Mayo	1	8	1	1	1	1		4	3	20
Moos	1	10	1	1	1	1		6	2	23
Orr	1	7						3		11
Piccolo	1	19	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	32
Robeson	1	12	1	1	1	2		6		24
Sherman	1	7	1	1		1		6		17
Spencer	1	12	1	1	1	1		3		20

* Information on the core planning teams for year 1 of CANAL was provided by CANAL staff.

** Jungman did not participate in CANAL until after Orientation and Day 1 and Day 2 training.

P=principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

Table 1 continued

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1

School	P	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	TOTAL
Stowe	1	19	1	1	1	1		4		28
Sumner	1	8			1	1		8	2	21
Terrell	1	18	1	1	1	2	2	7	3	36
Westinghouse	1	12	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	23
Williams	1	18	1	1	2	1	2	11	8	45
Woodson	1	13	1	1	1	1		6		24
	41	496	36	37	36	47	21	203	50	967

P=principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

The information on core team composition was provided to the Monitoring Commission by staff of CANAL.

representation. The Monitoring Commission received no other written materials from CANAL staff that addressed team size.

The tremendous variation in the size of the 41 core planning teams suggests that little control was exercised over team size. Some of the teams were so small they violated the requirements for representation. Others were so large that it would be difficult if not impossible, to work as a decisive planning team. In that neither the CANAL proposal nor subsequent staff materials specified criteria for size, little more can be done than assert that the failure to deal with team size will limit the teams' potential for success.

The proposal however, did specify the criteria for representation. Table 1 shows that the composition of core teams fell far short of the representational stipulations. The only categories consistently showing substantial representation were those for teachers and the principal. The list of core planning team members provided to the Monitoring Commission indicated that all teams were represented by the school principal. Moreover, the 41 schools were represented by a total of 496 teachers. The number of teachers varied considerably from one team to another with one team, Manierre, having as few as five teachers and another, DuSable, with as many as 33. Most teams included between 10 and 15 teachers.

Given the importance of controlling the size of core teams, teachers were one constituency where some limit on numbers should have been exercised. It is not clear why so many teachers were placed on so many teams. It is unknown whether school were advised by CANAL on the considerations of team size, or whether teachers and school administrators made unilateral decisions. But, it does seem clear that teams with

inordinately large numbers of teachers were problematic, not only because they were difficult to manage because of numbers, but because teachers were likely to dominate and overwhelm the non-teaching core team members.

A review of non-teaching members in Table 1 shows that not only were the non-teaching members often in the minority, but in many cases their numbers were insufficient to meet the numerical requirements of the CANAL proposal. This means that at the very beginning, CANAL staff failed to compose core teams properly. Table 2 shows the number of constituents representing ancillary staff, parents and community members on each of the 41 teams.

The constituent least likely to be represented on core teams was that of community members. Seventeen teams failed to have even one community member and another 11 had only one, as shown in Table 2. Thus, only 13 core teams met the prescribed number of at least two community members. Project CANAL staff have neither provided an explanation for the deviation from the original proposal, nor have indicated the anticipated effect that the failure in representation will have on the original CANAL concept.

Table 2 also shows that the representation of ancillary staff and parents were inadequately represented on some teams. Two teams had no representatives from the school's ancillary staff and two others had only one or two members. The proposal called for a minimum of three ancillaries on each team. Two teams had no parent representatives while 10 others had no more than three parents. The proposal called for a minimum of five parents on each team. Again, there was no explanation for the failure to properly constitute the core planning teams.

Table 2

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1
ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total Teams
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Ancillary Staff*	2	1	1	5	32	41
Parents	2	1	3	6	29	41
Community Members	17	11	7	4	2	41

*Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

The numbers across the top row refer to the teams with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more members of the constituent categories. Thus, two teams had 0 or no ancillaries, two had 0 parents, 17 had 0 community members, one had only 1 ancillary, one had only 1 parent, 11 had only 1 community member, etc..

The proposal statement on composing core teams was explicit because Project CANAL was based on the assumption that the presence of a broad representative group of leaders and planners was the cornerstone for promoting change in the quality of education. The failure to assure that the teams conformed to the model described in the proposal represented a serious failure of implementation and jeopardized the potential of Project CANAL at the outset.

The CANAL proposal did not specify how team members were to be recruited, and the manner in which they were formed varied. As Table 3 shows, 23 of the 41 teams were selected. The information provided to the Monitoring Commission did not indicate how members were selected or who selected them. In eight cases the teams were elected, but it is not clear who was elected by whom. While it is apparent that teachers may join to elect teachers to the teams, it is less obvious who and how parents and community members were elected. Were parents elected by some organization of school parents? Were community members elected by some group in or by the entire community? Or were parents and community members elected by teachers?

Three teams were made up of volunteers. Again, it is not clear how the process was organized and who was in the position to volunteer. Who evaluated the volunteers? Were all those who volunteered accepted, or were there some criteria for acceptance? Who did they volunteer to? The principal? CANAL staff?

Seven of the teams were formed by some combination of selection, election and volunteering. The information did not specify who was selected, who was elected, or who volunteered when such a mix of methods was used.

Table 3

METHODS FOR RECRUITING CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS

Method	Number Of CPT's Recruited
Selected*	23
Elected**	8
Volunteers	3
Selected/elected	2
Selected/volunteers	1
Selected/elected/volunteers	4
Total	41

* Information on who selected members for the teams and the process used for selection was not available.

** No information was available on who did the electing. When teams were composed with multiple methods, who was recruited by which method was not available.

Given the importance of the core planning teams, the process for constituting them deserved careful attention. In addition, the CANAL proposal was predicated on the assumption that much of the value of CANAL rested on learning lessons that could be replicated in other schools. Replication, however, requires uniform procedures in implementation so it is possible to draw conclusions about what influenced program outcomes. For example, if lessons were to be learned from the appointment of members to core planning teams, the procedures for doing so should have been as uniform and carefully documented as possible .

The lack of careful controls will limit seriously the lessons that can be drawn from CANAL. The variations in how the teams were composed, in their size, and who they represented will make it impossible to assign program outcomes to core planning teams. In addition, the variations in procedures also could result in problems of credibility for core teams as well as a reluctance by the school community or any other group to accept them as a legitimate decision-making body.

Whatever the implications of the methods for selecting, the teams, the methods were overwhelmed by the failure of the teams to represent the proposed constituencies. Tables 1 and 2, suggest a lack of control or attention on the part of CANAL staff to the composition of the teams. It also suggests a lack of appreciation of the critical role that the teams were expected to play in CANAL.

The inadequate composition of core teams may have been somewhat offset by who actually participated in the CANAL process once the project got underway. Analysis of who from core planning teams attended training activities provided additional information on the quality of the implementation of CANAL.

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION

The purpose of Orientation was to provide core planning teams with an overview of Project CANAL, its purpose and goals; explain the role of the core planning team; and, introduce team members to skills that would enable them to implement school-based management and governance through shared decision-making in their local schools. A total of 12 Orientation sessions were held in which 40 schools participated. Orientation training began November 1, 1989, and ended on November 22, 1989. The Monitoring Commission staff observed nine of the 12 sessions that provided training to 30 of the 40 CANAL schools.

The 40 CANAL schools (initially only 40 schools participated in that one school did not take part in CANAL training activities until after Day 2 training) were trained in one-day sessions in groups of three to five teams. The one-day sessions consisted of two presentations in the morning that included an overview of Project CANAL presented by CANAL staff and, a presentation by an outside consultant on interactive techniques for team building and shared governance. The content focused on the validity of different perceptions, and the value of understanding the views of others in developing a consensus decision model for school-based management.

In the afternoon, the core planning team of each school met separately to discuss specific problems in their school and practice the methods that were presented in the morning. The day ended with a reassembly of the individual core planning teams where each team summarized their activities and achievements. Generally, the morning was used to provide core teams with training on team building skills, while the afternoon was used to perfect these skills.

While Table 1 showed the composition of core planning teams for each school, Table 4 shows who actually took part in the Orientation training.[6] A review of Table 4 reveals that the only categories of participants on core planning teams that were well represented were those of the principal and teachers. Ancillary school staff, parents and community members on core teams were much less likely to attend training and were not present to work with many teams.

In four instances, principals were not available to represent their schools nor was their absence compensated for by the attendance of assistant principal, Table 4. Four schools had five or fewer teachers present, but it is difficult to assess how many were needed to represent teachers' perspectives in a given school. The more likely problem was the presence of so many teachers that they overwhelmed the representation of other perspectives. In eight instances, teams had 15 or more teachers in attendance, one had as many as 28 and another had 30.

Also, it is difficult to understand what the quality of team building exercises could have been with large groups. Fifteen teams had 20 or more members in attendance. The problems of coalescing so many individuals into a well organized body for problem analysis and shared decision-making must be substantial if not impossible.

Despite the large number of individuals on many of the teams, ancillary staff, parents and community members were likely to be underrepresented. Table 4 shows that ancillary staff (building engineers, lunch roommanagers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives) were much less likely to attend Orientation than principals

---

[6] Data on attendance at Orientation were taken from the attendance sheets included in CANAL's January 1989 Quarterly Progress Report, Appendix VI.

or teachers. The same was true for parents, and it is obvious, just by skimming the column for community members in Table 4, that they were underrepresented or not represented at all on most core planning teams. This will be reviewed in greater detail below.

The last column of Table 4 shows the difference between the number of members listed by CANAL as serving on core teams and the number who actually were present for Orientation. In all cases except teams from four schools, fewer members attended Orientation than were on the teams. A perfect attendance of all core team members would have resulted in 950 participants. Only 731 actually attended which meant that 219 or about 23 percent of core team members did not receive Orientation training.[7]

Given the important role that core team members were expected to play in implementing CANAL, and the importance of orientation to the concept and purpose of CANAL, the high rate of absenteeism was unfortunate. From the perspective of size the absences reduced the unwieldiness of the teams, but given the importance of training team members to carry out their responsibilities, the absences were most unfortunate. It did not signal a good start for Project CANAL.

When attendance was examined more closely in terms of the constituents categories, it was found that absences were not randomly distributed across the groups. Table 5 shows that principals and teachers were most likely to be present with about 90 percent of the principals in attendance and about 94 percent of the teachers. However,

---

[7] No attempt was made to compare the names of those attending a training sessions with the names of core team members.

Table 4

PARTICIPATION IN ORIENTATION TRAINING: 40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS*

SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant													
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER	TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
November 1														
Clark	1		11		1				3	1	3**	20	22	- 2
Frazier	1		11						1	1	4	18	26	- 8
Hughes	1		8						2			11	19	- 8
Spencer	1		10		1	1			4			17	20	- 3
Sumner	1		6						4	2	1	14	21	- 7
November 2														
Bradwell	1		11						4	1	2	19	27	- 9
Cooper	1		4						3	1	2	11	17	- 6
Hearst	1		10						5		3	19	22	- 3
November 3														
Bennett	1		10		1				2			14	22	- 8
Dett	1		5	1	2	1			4			14	14	0
Hammond	1		10			1	1		4			17	22	- 5
Howe			15	1	1	1	1		2			21	28	- 7
November 4														
Lowell	1		10	1		1	2		3	1		19	26	- 7
Sherman	1		7				1		4			13	17	- 4
November 7														
Dyett	1		13				1		4		1***	20	25	- 5
Terrell	1	1	14		1		1		2	4		24	36	-12
Woodson	1		12	1	1	1			6	1		23	24	- 1
November 9														
DuBois	1		14		1							16	22	- 6
Dumas	1	1	13	1			1		6			23	25	- 2
Gale	1		15			1	1		3			21	24	- 3
November 10														
Byford	1		10				1		1			13	18	- 6
DePriest	1		11	1	1		1		4	1		20	21	- 1
Gregory	1		8						1			10	20	-10
Mayo	1		8	1	1	1			5	1		18	20	- 2

* Data on attendance were taken from Appendix VI, CANAL's Quarterly Progress Report, January 1989.

** Ancillary staff were not differentiated on the attendance sheets for the first two sessions and were placed here under other.

*** The position of one attendee was not reported.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; TOTAL= the total number of attendees from each school; CPT= the number of members on each school's core planning team; DIFF=the difference between the number on the core planning team and the number attending the session.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4 continued

PARTICIPATION IN ORIENTATION TRAINING: 40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS*

SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant											TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER			
November 14														
Bass	1		12				1		1	1		16	26	-10
Goldblatt	1	1	12	1	1	1	1		3			21	22	- 1
Piccolo	1	1	16				1		4		2*	25	32	- 7
November 15														
Fernwood	1		9									10	20	-10
Guggenheim	1		10			1	1		2			15	19	- 4
Manierre	1		5	1	1	1	1	1	4	2		17	21	- 4
Williams			15	1		1	1	1	2			21	45	-24
November 16														
DuSable			30				1		2	1	3**	37	34	+ 3
November 21														
Carter	1		11						6	1	1***	20	28	- 8
Lafayette	1		15	1	1		1					19	26	- 7
Stowe	1	1	28	1	1	1	1		1			35	28	+ 7
November 22														
Kelvyn Park	1		16		1		1		3			22	30	- 8
Moos			3	1			1		3			8	23	-15
Orr	1		8			1	1			1		12	11	+ 1
Robeson	1		12	1		1	1		2		1***	19	24	- 5
Westinghouse	1		12			1	2	1	1	1		19	23	- 4
	36	5	460	14	16	16	26	3	111	21	23	731	950	-221

* a counselor and a security guard
** a counselor, psychologist and nurse
***unknown

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer;LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; CPT=core planning team; DIFF=difference between the number of members on the core planning team and the number attending the session.

only slightly more than half, 52 percent, of the ancillary staff, 56 percent of the parents and only 43 percent of the community members attended Orientation, Table 5. Thus, not only were ancillary staff, parents and community members poorly represented in the original composition of core planning teams, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, but almost half of those who were on the teams, failed to show up for Orientation, Tables 4 and 5.

The low percentage of attendees among ancillaries, parents and community members was compounded further by the way absences were distributed across core teams. A few teams had many representatives, while many had none. Table 6 shows the number of teams that had 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 or more representatives from the three constituent groups. Nine teams had no ancillary staff, four had no parents and 24 had no community members present to work with the teams in Orientation. Moreover, another nine teams had only one ancillary, six had one parent, and 13 had one community member. The results reinforce the concern that teachers dominated core teams.

Only 14 of the teams had the required minimum of three or more (six had three and 8 had four or more) ancillaries present. Only 15 had four or more parents. Recall that the CANAL proposal called for a minimum of five parents on each team. While not shown on Table 6, only five of the 15 teams with four or more parents had the required minimum of five parents in attendance. Only three teams met the minimum of two or more community members (two teams had two members and one team had four or more).

Table 5

ORIENTATION TRAINING: ATTENDANCE OF THE 40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Core Team Members*	In Attendance	
		Number	Percentage
Principals	40	36	90%
Teachers	487	460	94%
Ancillaries**	176	91	52%
Parents	198	111	56%
Community Members	49	21	43%
	950	719	76%

* The number of core team members does not include those from Jungman School because it was not a part of CANAL at the time of Orientation training.

** Attendance data for the first two sessions of Orientation did not differentiate ancillary staff. Recall, from Table 4 that they were included in the category of Other. Here, those in Other for the first two sessions have been included as ancillary staff. Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Information on attendance was provided to the Monitoring Commission by CANAL staff.

Table 6

ATTENDANCE OF 40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS AT ORIENTATION
ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total Teams
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Ancillary Staff*	9	9	8	6	8	40
Parents	4	6	8	7	15	40
Community Members	24	13	2	0	1	40

* Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

The numbers across the top row refer to teams with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more members of the constituent categories. Thus, nine teams had 0 or no ancillaries, four teams had 0 parents, 24 teams had 0 community members, nine teams had only 1 ancillary, six teams had only 1 parent, etc..

Orientation was intended to familiarize core teams with the purpose and goals of CANAL and to initiate team building skills essential for them to provide leadership to their schools. Presumably, the training especially was important in developing a good working relationship between individuals with such disparate perspectives as school administrators, teachers, ancillary school staff, parents and community members. However, most of the teams were made up of teachers and their principals while ancillary staff, parents and community members were either absent or far fewer in number than stipulated by the CANAL proposal.

The representation of the intended constituencies on core planning teams simply did not materialize as envisioned by the CANAL proposal. Not only were many core planning teams permitted to organize without the broad-base of members who could "...represent during each phase of the school improvement plan to ensure that every segment of the school population takes an active part in creating a school environment ...,"[8] but nearly half of the non-teacher members who were on the teams did not attend Orientation. Thus, at the outset, the central concept of CANAL, the core planning team, was not implemented.

The extent to which the composition of core planning teams fell short of representing the constituencies required by the CANAL proposal at the outset of the program was troubling. Even more problematic was the poor attendance at Orientation by those who were on the teams. It meant that the intended teams were not present to benefit from CANAL training. Nor were they available to begin building the skills for

---

[8] Creating A New Approach To Learning, Settlement Fund Proposal, April 13, 1988, p. 3.

working together as a team in bringing about school-based management and shared decision-making.

The importance of having the majority of core planning team members present to initiate the process of developing a new team to manage the local schools seems integral to the CANAL concept. The capacity of the teams to provide direction and leadership to the schools was essential for the success of CANAL, and the explicit purpose of the CANAL training was to assure that team members would have such capacity. The quality and quantity of the training offered by the CANAL staff indeed is moot if the team members who need the skills are not present to develop them.

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1 ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS

The second phase of training core planning teams was to build on the content of Orientation and further assist team members to develop skills in school-based management and shared decision-making. The purpose was to provide core team members with a further awareness of the school-based management concept and teach them how to engage in shared decision-making so they could function as management teams within their own schools. More specifically, the training was to make participants aware of the importance of mindsets that can either stifle or create new visions for the potential of a school. The emphasis was placed on vision creation, human development skills, brainstorming new ideas, and the importance of the consensus building process. The Nominal Group Technique was used as a primary method for developing consensus building skills.

The core teams received two days of training in this sequence. Day 1, began on November 29 and was completed on December 13, and Day 2, began on December 14 and ended on January 17. Commission staff were present to monitor all nine of the sessions for Day 1 which involved 40 schools.

The attendance of core planning teams for Day 1 training continued to fall far short of the intent of the CANAL proposal.[9] A brief glance at Table 7 indicates that Day 1 training was well-attended by teachers and their principals, but as in Orientation, poorly attended by the members of other constituencies.

The totals at the end of Table 7 show that 717 individuals took part in Day 1 training. This represented a slight decline from the 731 who attended Orientation, Table 4, a drop from about 77 percent of all the members of core planning teams to 75 percent. It means that 235 core team members did not participate in the training offered in Day 1.

The modest decline in the total number of individuals in attendance, however, fails to convey the real character of the problem. Closer inspection of Table 7 indicates that the attendance across constituent groups was even more distorted than at Orientation. The number of principals and teachers at the sessions actually increased. Thus, 36 principals attended Orientation while 37 took part in Day 1, and they were joined by two assistant principals. One school, Williams, stood out as an exception in that it had no principal present for either session. The number of teachers represented a more substantial increase, rising from 460 at Orientation to 487 at Day 1 training.

---

[9] The data for attendance at Day 1 training were taken from CANAL's January 1989 Quarterly Progress Report, Appendix VI.

While the number of teachers and principals in attendance was expected given the original composition of core teams, the absence of members representing other constituencies mirrored this imbalance between who was in its team and who attended training. Table 8 shows the proportion of team members attending for each constituent group. The number of principals and teachers at Day 1 was very close to the number of members originally placed on core teams with 98 percent of the principals and 100 percent of teachers present. But this was not the case for those representing other constituencies.

The data emphasize the original problem of inappropriate team composition, that is, not only was size an issue, but the overwhelming number of teachers must have minimized the unique input of non-teaching constituents.

Of the 176 ancillary staff holding membership on teams, only 42 percent attended Day 1 training, Table 8. Recall, from Table 5, that 52 percent of the ancillaries on the teams attended Orientation training. Thus, their representation on the teams declined rather than improved as training progressed.

Similarly, recall that 198 parents were appointed to core teams, but only 47 percent came to the Day 1 training, Table 8. Again, this represented a decline from Orientation when 56 percent of the parents appointed to teams attended, Table 5. And, of the very few community members all who were placed on the teams to begin with, 49, only 18 members of them showed up for Day 1 training. Recall from Table 5 that a few more, 21 members or 43 percent came to Orientation.

As for Orientation, the few representatives of non-principal/non-teacher constituencies who did show up for Day 1 training were not equally distributed across

Table 7

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 1*

40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant											TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER			
November 29														
DuBois	1		12	1								14	22	- 8
Dumas	1		14	1	1				1			18	25	- 7
Gale	1		15			1	1		1			19	24	- 5
Woodson	1		12		1	1			4	1	1**	21	24	- 3
November 30														
Bennett			12			1			3			16	22	- 6
Byford	1		10				1		1			13	18	- 6
DePriest	1		11	1	1		1		5	1		21	21	0
Howe	1		14									15	28	-13
December 2														
Guggenheim	1		10						1	1		13	19	- 6
Manierre	1		4	1			1	1	6	2		16	21	- 5
Sherman	1		8				1		5			15	17	- 2
Terrell	1	1	21				1		2			26	36	-10
Williams			15		1	1	1		4	1		23	45	-22
December 5														
Carter	1		11						3	1		16	28	-12
Clark	1		9	1	1		1		1	1		15	22	- 7
Frazier	1		13		1		1		2	1		19	26	- 7
Hughes	1		10									11	19	- 8
Spencer	1		12		1		1		2			17	20	- 3
Sumner	1		8			1	1	2	3			16	21	- 5
December 6														
Bass	1		11		1		1		1			15	26	-11
Goldblatt	1		13		1	1	1		5	1		23	22	+ 1
Lowell	1		11	1			1	1	4			19	26	- 7
Piccolo	1	1	18			1	2	1	1		1***	26	32	- 6
December 7														
Bradwell			10					1	5	1	1****	18	27	-10
Cooper	1		5				1		3	1		11	17	- 6
Dett	1		6	1	1	1			4			14	14	0
Hearst	1		9			1	1		3			15	22	- 7
Stowe	1		25		1		1		2			30	28	+ 2

* Data on attendees was taken from attendance sheets in Appendix 11 of CANAL's January 1989 Quarterly Progress Report.

** Position not given

*** Security guard

**** District council president

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; CPT=core planning team; DIFF=difference between the number of members on the core planning team and the number attending the session.

Table 7 continued

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 1*

40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant											TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER			
December 8														
Dyett	1		15				1		3			20	25	- 5
Fernwood	1		9						3			13	20	- 7
Gregory	1		8			1			2			12	20	- 8
Hammond	1		10		1		1		2	1		16	22	- 6
Mayo	1		8	1	1		1		4			16	20	- 4
Moos	1		9	1	1		1		4			17	23	- 6
December 12														
Kelvyn Park	1		15		1				2	2		21	30	- 9
Orr	1		10			1	1			2		15	11	+ 4
Robeson	1		11				2		2			16	24	- 8
Westinghouse	1		13		1	1				1	2*	19	23	- 4
December 13														
DuSable	1		34			1	1					37	34	+ 3
Lafayette	1		16	1	1		1					20	26	- 6
	37	2	487	10	17	13	28	6	94	18	5	717	950**	-235

* Two attendees were classified as school staff who were also parents of children in the school

** The total of core planning team members does not include Jungman school which did not participate in CANAL at the time of Day 1 training.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; CPT=core planning team; DIFF=difference between the number of members on the core planning team and the number attending the session.

the 40 teams. As a consequence, many teams participated in Day 1 training with no or only one or two representatives of ancillary staff, parents and community members. Table 9 indicates that five teams had no ancillary staff, seven had no parents, and as many as 25 had no representatives of community groups in attendance. Only 12 teams had the required minimum of three or more ancillaries, 29 teams had three or fewer parents (the CANAL proposal required five on each team), and only three teams had the minimum number of two community members. Clearly, the participation of core team members did not improve for Day 1 training. And while representatives of ancillary staff and parents were woefully inadequate, community members were no longer a meaningful part of the process.

Table 10 compares the composition and attendance of constituencies at Orientation and Day 1 training in order to show more clearly the decline in participation. Thus, while only two teams originally were composed with no ancillary staff, nine teams completed Orientation without ancillaries and five teams attended Day 1 training without ancillary staff.

Only two teams originally were organized without parent representatives, but four teams had no parents present at Orientation, and this increased to seven at Day 1.

Seventeen teams were allowed to form without community representatives while 24 teams completed Orientation and 25 of the teams took part in Day 1 training without the benefit of any input from community members.

Table 10 also displays the number of teams that had only one representative, two representatives and so on. The results make it clear that as training progressed, the intended representation of ancillaries, parents and community members diminished.

Table 8

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 1
REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES OF THE 40 TEAMS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Core Team Members*	In Attendance	
		Number	Percentage
Principals**	40	39	98%
Teachers	487	487	100%
Ancillaries***	176	74	42%
Parents	198	94	47%
Community Members	49	18	37%
	950	712	75%

* The number of core team members does not include those from Jungman School because it was not a part of CANAL at the time of Day 1 training.

** Two assistant principals were included in the count of the number of principals attending Day 1.

***Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Table 10 also makes clear the lack of representation in terms of minimum members required in the CANAL proposal. Thus, 37 teams (the sums of M under three and M under four or more for ancillaries in Table 10), were composed with the minimum of three or more ancillaries but only 14 teams completed Orientation and 12 completed Day 1 with those minimums. The same decline in representation occurred for parents. While 29 teams had four or more parents (the proposal required five) at the time of composition, only 15 teams attended orientation with four or more parents and this went down to 10 teams by Day 1.

Community members fared the worst. Only 13 teams had the required two or more members (the sums of M under two, M under three and M under four or more in Table 10) at the time of composition, but only three teams met the minimum at Orientation, and only three at Day 1. Note that no team had more than two community members present at Day 1 and only one team had that many at Orientation.

Also note that at this point no students were involved in core planning teams. The original proposal suggested that Student Council representatives may be included on high school core planning teams. None of the teams from the high schools benefited from such involvement.

Clearly, Project CANAL experienced substantial problems involving ancillary staff, parents, and community members on core planning teams. The problems already were apparent when the teams were composed, and even though it represented a direct violation of the CANAL proposal, no remedies were taken at that time. During Orientation training, the inadequate composition of core teams was confirmed to be much worse than the original data on the composition indicated; and, by Day 1 the

Table 9

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 1
REPRESENTATION OF ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS
ON THE 40 CORE TEAMS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total Teams
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Ancillary Staff*	6	9	13	10	2	40
Parents	7	8	8	7	10	40
Community Members	25	12	3	0	0	40

* Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

The numbers across the top row refer to teams with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more members of the constituent categories. Thus, six teams had 0 or no ancillaries, seven had 0 parents, 25 had 0 community members, nine had only 1 ancillary, eight had only 1 parent, etc..

problem not only persisted, but got even worse. At each juncture, the CANAL staff could have made corrections to bring the composition of the teams into conformance with the requirements of CANAL proposal, but no action was taken.

The failure to deal with the problem cut deeply into the potential of CANAL to achieve its intended goal. The plan to dramatically alter the traditional management of local schools by training representatives of primary stakeholders to participate in managing local schools through shared governance never got off the ground. Those who received training, but for a few exceptions, consisted primarily of teachers and their principals.

The decision by CANAL leaders to move forward with scheduled training activities as though representative teams of stakeholders existed was unfortunate. It may suggest little commitment to or understanding of the original concept around which CANAL was organized. It also may indicate the failure of staff to recognize the importance of involving wholly intact, functional teams in each phase of training in order to achieve the goals of CANAL. The implementation of core planning teams and their training in shared governance, as envisioned by CANAL, was seriously undermined at this point.

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2 ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS

Day 2 training in school-based management and shared decision-making was a continuation of the training initiated in the Day 1 sessions. The specific purpose for Day 2 was to develop the school-based management and shared decision-making skills of core planning teams and train them to motivate the entire school community to participate in improving the quality of the educational programs in their schools. Again, the

Table 10

COMPARISON OF 40 CORE TEAMS
MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION AND DAY 1 TRAINING
ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team														
	0			1			2			3			4 or more		
	M	O	D1	M	O	D1	M	O	D1	M	O	D1	M	O	D1
Ancillary Staff*	2	9	6	1	9	9	1	8	13	5	6	10	32	8	2
Parents	2	4	7	1	6	8	3	8	8	6	7	7	29	15	10
Community Members	17	24	25	11	13	12	7	2	3	4	0	0	2	1	0

*Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

M=memberships; O=Orientation; D1=Day 1 training.

The numbers across the top row refer to teams with 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 or more members of the categories of constituents. The letters below the numbers refer to the original membership of the team, M; attendance at Orientation, O; and attendance at Day 1 training, D1. Thus, the first column indicates that two teams had no ancillary staff members, two teams had no parents, and 17 teams had no community members. The second column shows that nine teams had no ancillaries at Orientation, four teams had no parents at Orientation, and 24 teams had no community members at Orientation, etc..

assumption of the Project CANAL was that the best means for enhancing educational achievement was to have teams of key stakeholders manage the local schools.

Nine sessions were used to train the core teams of the 40 participating schools. However, due to lack of notification of training schedules, Monitoring Commission staff were able to attend only five of the Day 2 sessions. The five sessions that were observed represented 21 of the 40 schools. Attendance data, however, was available for all of the nine sessions.

The core planning teams participating in Day 2 training not only failed to improve with respect to the required constituencies, but deteriorated even further from what occurred in Orientation and Day 1 training.[10] The totals on attendance shown in Table 11 indicate that the number of participants in Day 2 training was 691. It will be recalled from Table 4 that 731 core team members took part in Orientation and 717 attended Day 1 training. Thus, of the original 950 members appointed to the 40 teams, those who actually attended CANAL training declined from about 77 percent at Orientation to 75 percent on Day 1 to about 73 percent on Day 2.

Even more problematic, however, was the continued inadequate participation of ancillary staff, parents, and community members. What was observed with respect to the composition of core teams, and attendance at Orientation and Day 1 training, persisted for attendance at Day 2 training.

At this point, the core planning teams clearly were dominated by teachers and principals. Given the length of time the core teams were in existence by Day 2 training,

---

[10] The data on attendance for Day 2 training were taken from CANAL's January 1989 Quarterly Progress Report, Appendix VI, and from attendance sheets provided by the CANAL staff.

all the training they had received, the concept of core teams, as envisioned by the original CANAL proposal, seemed abandoned.

It should be noted, however, that the number of principals and teachers in attendance at Day 2 also declined. Thus, while 36 principals, excluding assistant principals, attended Orientation, Table 4, and 37 attended Day 1, Table 7, by Day 2 it had declined to 33, Table 11. The number of teachers also declined from 487 on Day 1 to 447 on Day 2. While the number of principals and teachers still dominated core planning teams, their original high level of participation was not maintained. Whether the decline was due to scheduling problems, flagging interest, or other reasons is open to conjecture. The decline stands out because of the concomitant decline in attendance by ancillaries, parents and community members.

As Table 12 shows less than half of the ancillaries, 48 percent, and barely more than half of the parents, 52 percent, attended Day 2 training. Only 12 of the 49 community members were present indicating a continued lack of attention to the importance of their contribution to core teams. For all intents of purposes, community members disappeared from core planning teams by the time of Day 2 training.

Table 13 shows the number of teams with 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 or more representatives of constituent groups. Three teams had no representatives of the ancillary school staff, five teams had no parents present, and 31 teams had no community members participating in Day 2 training. Only 15 of the 40 teams met the minimum of three or more ancillaries, only 11 had four or more parents present (recall that the original proposal called for a minimum of five parents on each team), and only three teams had

Table 11

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 2*

40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant													
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER	TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
December 14														
Bennett	1		10			1			2			14	22	- 8
Byford	1		9				1		2			13	19	- 6
DePriest	1		11	1	1		1		4	1		20	21	- 1
Howe			16			1	1					18	28	-10
December 15														
Manierre	1		6	1	1		1		5	2		17	21	- 4
Sherman	1		6				1		5			13	17	- 4
Terrell	1		16				1		2			20	36	-16
Williams			15			1	1	1	3	1		22	45	-23
Woodson	1		13		1		1		4			20	24	- 4
December 19														
Carter	1		10						1	1		13	28	-15
Clark	1		10	1	1		1		2	1	1**	18	22	- 4
Frazier	1		10	1	1		1		5	1		20	26	- 6
Hughes	1		10			1	1		2			15	19	- 4
Spencer	1		12			1	1					15	20	- 5
Sumner			6			1	1		5	2	1**	16	21	- 5
December 20														
DuBois	1		15						1			17	22	- 5
Dumas	1		11	1	1	1	1		3			19	25	- 6
Gale	1		13	1	1	1	1					18	24	- 6
Guggenheim	1		10			1			2			14	19	- 5
December 21														
Bradwell	1		10	1	1	1			5		1**	20	27	- 8
Cooper	1		5				1		2	1		10	17	- 7
Dett	1		5	1	1				4			12	14	- 2
Hearst	1		9		1	1			2	2		16	22	- 6
Stowe	1		22		1	1	1		1			27	28	- 1

* Data on attendance for December 14 through December 21 was taken from attendance sheets in Appendix II of CANAL's January 1989 Quarterly Progress Report. Data for the remainder of the sessions was taken from attendance sheets provided by CANAL staff.

**Position not given.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; CPT=core planning team; DIFF=difference between the number of members on the core planning team and the number attending the session

Table 11 continued

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING DAY 2

40 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT

Date And School	Category Of Participant													
	A	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER	TOTAL	CPT	DIFF
January 10														
Bass	1	1	10				1		1			14	26	-12
Goldblatt	1		13			1	1		5			21	22	- 1
Lowell	1		10		1		1	1	2			16	26	-10
Piccolo	1		18	1			1		5			26	32	- 6
January 11														
Dyett			12		1	1			3			17	25	- 8
Fernwood			9	1	1				2			13	20	- 7
Gregory	1	1	7				1		2			12	20	- 8
Hammond	1		11				1	1	3			17	22	- 5
Mayo	1		7	1	1		1		4			15	20	- 5
Moos			7	1	1		1		3			13	23	-10
January 12														
Kelvyn Park	1	1	16		1	1		1	3			24	30	- 6
Orr												0	11	-11
Robeson	1		11		1		2		2			17	24	- 7
Westinghouse	1		14		1	1	1	1	2			21	23	- 2
January 17														
DuSable	1	1	28			1	1		3		5*	40	34	+ 6
Lafayette	1	1	14	1	1							18	26	- 8
	33	5	447	13	20	17	29	5	102	12	8	691	950**	-261

* Other for DuSable included two psychologists, a nurse, an options counselor, and one whose position was unknown.

**The total number of core planning team members does not include the team from Jungman school which did not participate in CANAL Day 2 training.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; CPT=core planning team; DIFF=the difference between the number of members on the core planning team and the number attending the session.

the required two community representatives. As in Orientation and Day 1 training, no students participated in Day 2 training.

The attendance data indicated that core teams continued to fall far short of the mark in providing local schools with the broad-based group of representatives presumed necessary to effectuate change in school management through shared decision-making. Rather than gain momentum as the training progressed, the CANAL concept appeared to losing ground and the project seemed to become just another inservice training activity for teachers and principals.

TOTAL SITE TRAINING
ATTENDANCE OF CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS

While the core planning team was the focus of training in Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training, the purpose of Total Site training was to share the concepts of school-based management and shared decision-making with the broader audience of teachers and staff of the core planning team's school. Total Site training sessions were initiated on February 24, 1989, with the Jungman School. Presumably, the trainees should have included all of the teachers and key administrators of the school as well as core planning team members and its ancillary school staff (engineers, lunchroom managers, clerks, and teachers' aides), parents, and the members of the community. The sessions consisted of one day of training for each school participating in Project CANAL.

It should be noted that Jungman School which had not participated in Orientation, or Day 1 and Day 2 training took part in Total Site training. The training schedule of CANAL indicated that some special sessions were scheduled for Jungman and

Table 12

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 2
REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES OF THE 40 TEAMS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Core Team Members*	In Attendance	
		Number	Percentage
Principals**	40	38	95%
Teachers	487	447	92%
Ancillaries***	176	84	48%
Parents	198	102	52%
Community Members	49	12	24%
	950	683	72%

* The number of core team members does not include those from Jungman School which did not participate in Day 2 training.

** Five assistant principals who attended Day 2 training were included in the count of principals although all assistants who attended were accompanied by their principal. This means that only 35 schools were represented by their principal in Day 2 training.

***Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

presumably those sessions were used to bring Jungman's core planning team up to the level of the other 40 teams.

The training sessions were held during a regular school day. While the teachers and staff of a school were at the training center, their regular school duties were assumed by a cadre of substitute teachers and staff trained in advance by CANAL to substitute.

Whereas each of the 41 schools participating in CANAL were to take part in the Total Site training, according to Commission records and information received from CANAL, only 35 schools actually took part in such training. Two of the six schools appeared on the training schedule of CANAL but no data on attendance or their sessions could be located. The other four schools never appeared on the training schedules. Schools for which we have no record of Total Site training include Hammond, Hearst, Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, and Westinghouse. Requests to CANAL staff for information on these schools failed to produce any information. Table 14 shows the 35 schools that participated in CANAL.[11]

There were further discrepancies between the data provided on Total Site training in the May 31, 1989, Quarterly Report of CANAL and the documentation of Monitoring Commission staff. The CANAL report showed that only 33 individual schools participated, while Commission staff recorded training sessions for 35 schools. In a discussion between CANAL and Commission staff, it was resolved that 35 schools actually had received training.

---

[11] Information on the participants in Total Site Training was obtained from attendance sheets provided by CANAL staff and reported in their May 31, 1989 Quarterly Progress Report, pp. A3-5 through A3-21.

Table 13

PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: DAY 2
REPRESENTATION OF ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS
ON THE 40 CORE TEAMS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total Teams
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Ancillary Staff*	3	8	14	12	3	40
Parents	5	4	13	7	11	40
Community Members	31	6	3	0	0	40

* Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

The numbers across the top row refer to teams with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more members of the constituent categories. Thus, three teams had 0 or no ancillaries, five teams had 0 parents, 31 teams had 0 community members, eight teams had only 1 ancillary, four teams had only 1 parent, six teams had only 1 community member, etc..

Note, however, that there were more than 35 training sessions where seven of the schools were divided into two or more groups with each group receiving training on different days. Commission staff recorded 46 Total Site training sessions. Again, there was a discrepancy with the CANAL report which showed that only 43 such sessions were held. A check of the data indicated that the number of sessions was actually 46. Thus, the total number of separate teams provided with training sessions was 46.

Of the seven schools that were divided into more than one group for training, five schools were separated into two groups, one into three groups, and another into five groups, as shown in Table 14. While it appears that the size of the school may have played a role in whether a school was divided into more than one group, that was not consistently the case. Thus, Lafayette was divided into two groups, one of 35 and another of 34 participants, for a total of 69 individuals; and, Lowell consisted of two groups, one of 35 members and another of 29 for a total of 64. But other groups as large as 68 and one of 70 were trained in a single session. Another school, DuSable, was trained in five separate groups consisting of 22, 18, 12, 16 and 12 members which included some of the smallest groups that were trained.

Although Monitoring Commission staff were not provided with a rationale for some schools receiving Total Site training in more than one session, it would seem that separate groups, particularly the five small groups into which the DuS. le High School was divided, mitigated against the concept of developing a team of individuals capable of working together to initiate school-based management and shared governance. Presumably, an important part of Total Site training was to bring the core planning team together with the school staff. And, in part, the goal must have included allowing the

teams to build on and use the skills acquired in the previous training they had received from CANAL. Dividing the school into small groups emphasized further the failure of CANAL staff to appreciate the core planning team concept around which CANAL was organized.

Table 14 details who attended Total Site training for each of the 35 participating schools. In as much as the training was intended to involve the entire school community, the number of administrators and teachers in attendance was larger than their representation on core planning teams.

Note also that seven schools had one or more students attend the training session. This was the first such participation by students. The role of the students in the meetings was not clear because there was no prior evidence that students were core planning team members. They had not received training in the techniques or participated in practicing skills with core teams. Moreover, none of the teams with students in attendance were from high schools. Recall, however, that CANAL proposal suggested that it would be appropriate for students from high schools to be represented on the teams.

Table 15 shows the extent to which the core teams taking part in Total Site training were represented by their constituents. In as much as Total Site training was provided individually to each school it would be expected that the interest on the part of core team members would be maximized. For example, it was expected that larger numbers of ancillary staff would be available to participate in the training. Surprisingly, there was still one team that had no representatives of ancillary staff, seven teams had

Table 14

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING

46 CORE PLANNING TEAM SESSIONS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT*

Date And School	Category Of Participant											
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER**	TOTAL
2/24/89 Jungman	1		30		1		1		7	1	1	42
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)***	1		35				5	3				44
3/1/89 Carter	1		34	1			1	1	3			41
3/3/89 Terrell	1		31					1	16			49
3/7/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)	1	1	34		1	3	5	1	1			47
3/8/89 Moos	1		44		1	1	8		3			58
3/9/89 Dett	1	1	34	1			6	2				45
3/10/89 Dyett	1		36	1	1				4		1	44
3/13/89 Frazier	1	1	34	1	1		4		5			47
3/14/89 Woodson	1	1	22			2	2		2			30
3/15/89 Sumner	1	1	24				2	1	3			32
3/17/89 Byford	1		24				1					26
3/21/89 Bennett	1	1	31	2	1	1			24			61

* Data for attendance at total site training was taken from CANAL's May 31, 1989 Quarterly Progress Report.

** Other for Jungman was someone from Research and Evaluation, for Dyett a security officer.

***The parenthesis indicates that Lafayette was trained in 2 sessions, etc..

P=principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14 continued

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING

46 CORE PLANNING TEAM SESSIONS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT*

Date And School	Category Of Participant										
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM.	OTHER**	TOTAL
4/17/89 Sherman	1	1	34	1		1	1		6			45
4/17/89 DuSable (2 of 5)			18			1	3					22
4/18/89 Bradwell (1 of 2)	1	1	26			1			3		1	33
4/19/89 Bradwell (2 of 2)	1		21		1		2	1	3			29
4/20/89 Cooper	1		43				3	1	3			51
4/21/89 Guggenheim	1		15	1		1	1		3		3	25
5/2/89 Williams			30			1	1	2	20			54
5/3/89 DuSable (3 of 5)			12				2					14
5/4/89 Gale	1		43	1	1	2	6	3	1			58
5/4/89 DuSable (4 of 5)			16									16
5/5/89 Howe (1 of 3)			15.				1	1	2			19
5/9/89 DuSable (5 Of 5)			12			1	1					14

* Data on attendance at total site training was taken from CANAL's May 31, 1989 Quarterly Progress Report.

** Other for Bradwell was a student, and Guggenheim three students.

P= principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14 continued

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING

46 CORE PLANNING TEAM SESSIONS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT*

Date And School	Category Of Participant											
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER**	TOTAL
3/22/89 DuBois	1		23		1	2	1				4	32
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)	1		35	4		1	7	3	1		1	53
3/28/89 Goldblatt	1		34			1			11			47
3/29/89 Hughes	1		23	1		4		2	3			34
3/30/89 Manierre	1		30	1	1	2	10	2	8			55
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	1		29	3	1	2	6	2	3			47
4/3/89 Bass	1	1	38	1		1	1	1	23		1	68
4/6/89 Stowe (1 of 2)	1		38			2	3	1				45
4/7/89 Dumas	1	1	36				7		3		3	51
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)			28	1			4	1	1			35
4/13/89 DePriest	1		27	1	1		5	1	4		1	41
4/14/89 DuSable (1 of 5)	1		22			1	1					25
4/14/89 Gregory	1		37	1		1	1		1			42

*Data on attendance at total site training was taken from CANAL's May 31. 1989 Quarterly Progress Report.

**Other for Dubois was four students, for Lowell a security officer, for Bass a student, for Dumas three students, and for DePriest a security officer.

P=principal, T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

Table 14 continued

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING

35 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: SCHOOL AND CATEGORY OF PARTICIPANT*

Date And School	Category Of Participant											
	P	AP	T	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	OTHER**	TOTAL
5/15/89 Fernwood	1		23				5	1	2		9	41
5/16/89 Piccolo (1 of 2)			44		2		10	2				58
5/17/89 Piccolo (2 of 2)	1	3	43			1	15	3	4			70
5/18/89 Mayo	1	1	26		1		3		13		1	46
5/23/89 Howe (2 of 3)			30		1	1	3	1				36
5/24/89 Howe (3 of 3)	1		28				4					33
5/25/89 Spencer	1	1	44			1	2		4			53
5/30/89 Clark	1		33	1	1	2	3		3			44
	37	15	1369	23	17	37	147	37	193	1	26	1902

* Data for attendance at total site training was taken from CANAL's May 31, 1989 Quarterly Progress Report.

** Other for Fernwood and Mayo were students.

P=principal; AP=assistant principal; T=teacher; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member.

Data was not available for six of the CANAL schools. Hammond and Hearst appeared on the training schedule but no data on attendance or the sessions could be located. Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, and Westinghouse did not appear on the schedule for total site training and no data on attendance or sessions could be found.

only one such representative, and only 25, scarcely more than half of the 46 teams, had three or more ancillaries show up for Total Site training.

The largest increase among ancillary representatives was teacher aides who participated in greater numbers, and in some cases large numbers, Table 15. In one instance, Piccolo School, which was trained in two sessions, had as many as 15 teacher aides attend one session and another 10 attended the other session. Thus, as many as 25 teacher aides participated in the Total Site training of Piccolo School. It is difficult to assess what impact such a large increase among teacher aides had on the training process, on the capacity of the teams to achieve their goals or whether it compromised the ability of the trainers to accomplish their missions.

The attendance of parents did not improve. As many as 13 of the 46 training sessions had no parents present, another five had only one parent in attendance, while only 10 sessions had the required minimum of five or more parents, Table 15. Another four sessions had four parents present.

However, in six instances, schools were represented by a very large number of parents. Thus, Terrell School had 16 parents present, Bennett had 24, Goldblatt 11, Bass 23, Williams 20 and Mayo 13. There is no explanation why so many parents attended these sessions while the rest had so few. They were not members of the core planning teams. Did these parents represent an organized group that expected to share in school management? If so, did the large groups allow actual core team training to move forward? Did they represent a group of parents already organized to participate in the school's activities and was the group invited to the training? Or, were they a special interest group that had a particular concern with CANAL? No information was provided

on why so many attended, but at the very least, they must have complicated the attainment of training objectives and may have interfered with the training goals of the core planning teams.

Community members again were least likely to attend, as shown in Table 15. Of the 46 sessions, 45 had no community members present, and the one session that was the exception, had only one such member in attendance. At this point, it was clear that community members played no role in the CANAL core planning teams or in the overall CANAL training activities.

The goal of Total Site training, to train the broader constituency of key stakeholders in the school to engage in shared decision-making for school management, was not met in terms of who actually attended training. At most sessions, the teams primarily were composed of teachers and principal. Thus, the failures of implementation observed in Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training persisted in Total Site training.

Table 16 summarizes the decline in participation in training by ancillaries, parents and community members. The top portion of the table shows membership and participation of ancillary staff. While 37 of the 41 teams met the CANAL proposal requirements of at least three ancillaries, only 14 teams had the minimum number participate in Orientation, 12 in Day 1 and 15 in Day 2. While 25 teams had the minimum ancillaries present for the 46 Total Site training sessions, 21 teams still failed to do so.

The middle portion of the table shows the participation of parents. While 29 teams were composed with at least four parents members, only 15 had that many attend

Orientation, 10 were at Day 1 and 11 at Day 2, and, only 14 of the 46 Total Site training sessions had as many as four parents.

The lower portion of the table indicates that only 13 teams were composed with the minimum requirement of at least two community members. But, only three teams met the minimum at Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training. None met the minimum for Total Site training. Even more striking, 17 teams were composed with no community, 24 had no such members present at Orientation, 25 had none at Day 1, 31 had none at Day 2, and 45 had none present at the 46 Total Site sessions.

It only can be concluded that the model for school-based management, as proposed by CANAL, was not established during the first year of the program. Whatever the utility of the first year of training activity, it missed the point of the proposed model.

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPATION DURING YEAR 1

The purpose of CANAL training during the first year was to prepare core planning teams to initiate school-based management in their local schools; and, train them so they could, through the use of shared decision-making, develop school improvement plans. The purpose of the school improvement plans was to institute changes in the local schools that would lead to the improvement of academic achievement.

The goal of improving the academic achievement of local schools was not unique to CANAL; many other programs have been organized to that end. What was unique about CANAL was the attempt to implement, across 41 schools, models for school-based

Table 15

PARTICIPATION IN TOTAL SITE TRAINING: REPRESENTATION OF ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS IN 46 TRAINING SESSIONS*

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total Sessions
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Ancillary Staff**	1	7	13	15	10	46
Parents	13	5	3	11	14	46
Community Members	45	1	0	0	0	46

* Some schools were trained in two or more groups in their own sessions, as shown in Table 14. There were 46 sessions for total site training for the 41 core planning teams. The attendance here is based on core team members participating in the 46 sessions.

** Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

***Ten of the 14 sessions had the required number of five parents. The remaining four sessions had only four parents.

The numbers across the top row refer to the teams with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more members of the constituent categories. Thus, two teams had 0 or no ancillaries at the session, thirteen had 0 parents, forty five of the sessions had 0 community, seven had only one ancillary, five had only one parent, one one community member, etc..

management and shared decision-making that drew on the collective wisdom of a broad constituency of stakeholders in the local school. The core planning teams were the cornerstone of the CANAL plan as they were to be the organizational vehicle for placing the control and governance of the local school into the hands of the stakeholders.

Given their importance, the CANAL proposal carefully specified the composition of core planning teams. They were to consist of the primary constituencies of the school including principals, teachers, ancillary staff, parents and community members. In addition, the original plan suggested that high school students would play an active role in the CANAL process.

The initial purpose of the substantial investment of CANAL funds in training was predicated on the assumption that core planning teams could not be effective in implementing the concept of school-based management without special training and opportunities of skill building. The training was to orient team members to the concepts and techniques of shared decision-making. Shared decision-making, as a process, is central to school-based management because it incorporates techniques that make it possible for heterogeneous individuals, such as represented in the proposed core planning teams, to cooperate effectively. Through the combined efforts of their representatives, core planning teams, trained by CANAL, were intended to provide leadership that would bring about the desired reforms in the local schools.

In addition, core planning teams were seen as the source of creative change in the local school. They were to develop activities and approaches that would enable the school to break out of the restraints of the past. Thus, vision creation was an important part of the training experience. The CANAL intervention presumed that possibility

Table 16

COMPARISONS OF THE ATTENDANCE OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 MEMBERSHIP, ORIENTATION, DAY 1, DAY 2, AND TOTAL SITE*

ANCILLARY STAFF						
Membership And Type Of Training	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Membership	2	1	1	5	32	41
Orientation	9	9	8	6	8	40
Day 1	6	9	13	10	2	40
Day 2	3	8	14	12	3	40
Total Site Sessions	1	7	13	15	10	46
PARENTS						
Membership And Type Of Training	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Membership	2	1	3	6	29	41
Orientation	4	6	8	7	15	40
Day 1	7	8	8	7	10	40
Day 2	5	4	13	7	11	40
Total Site Sessions	13	5	3	11	14	46
COMMUNITY MEMBERS						
Membership And Type Of Training	Number Of Constituents On Team					Total
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	
Membership	17	11	7	4	2	41
Orientation	24	13	2	0	1	40
Day 1	25	12	3	0	0	40
Day 2	31	6	3	0	0	40
Total Site Sessions	45	1	0	0	0	46

* The membership rows total 41 because there were 41 teams, but only 40 teams participated in Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training. There were 46 sessions for Total Site training in which the 41 teams participated.

thinking and the ability to envision dramatic improvements in achievement would be enhanced with appropriate training.

The ultimate goal was indeed ambitious: to restructure school governance in order to improve the educational atmosphere and thereby increase levels of academic achievement. The first ambition, to restructure school governance, was not trivial in that the autocratic traditions of school management, like all other organizational traditions, are not likely to die easily. And from the beginning, it was clear that in order to achieve the difficult task, a well organized and trained core planning team would be required.

The second ambition, to increase levels of academic achievement, and particularly, to be able to attribute such changes to CANAL core planning teams, was even more difficult. The collective wisdom of leaders in improving academic achievement is that school-based management provides a vehicle for bringing about change. However, attributing such change in a specific context to a particular management model such as the one proposed by CANAL, requires extraordinary care in implementation so that changes in achievement can be associated with the model.

The evaluation of the CANAL implementation during its first year suggests basic flaws not only with respect to the composition and participation of core planning teams, but also with the capacity to associate changes in achievement with CANAL. So much variation was introduced in the processes for organizing core planning teams, the form and character of its composition, and the level of participation of team members, that it would be impossible to sustain any associations between what was implemented in the 41 schools and changes that took place.

Based on the analysis of the implementation of core planning teams, CANAL clearly failed to meet the expectations of the proposal. In summary, the following are some of the major problems identified by the Monitoring Commission staff.

First, the failure of core planning teams to represent the intended broad constituency of the local schools was in direct contradiction to the CANAL concept and to the explicit intent of the Settlement Fund Proposal. Not only was the composition of core planning teams a problem at the outset, but once training got underway, participation by the various constituencies deteriorated even further.

The character of the misrepresentation of core teams was such that those who were the newcomers to the school, the non-teaching/non-administrative members, were most likely to be left out of the process. The newcomers, ancillary staff, parents, and community members, who perhaps needed orientation and training most, were least likely to receive it. Community members actually disappeared from the teams, parents were absent from many and played a trivial role, at least numerically. And, even ancillary staff, who would seem to be readily accessible in that they are an integral part of the school community, were often absent or poorly represented.

The bottom line is that the first year of CANAL and all the training, preparation and resources that it required, has been completed; but, for most schools it was a program that focused on teachers and principals while ancillaries, parents and community members played only a peripheral role. While the training may have been relevant to teachers and principals, and may have provided them with new capacities to function, the broad-based management teams that were proposed by CANAL and deemed necessary for increasing academic achievement, did not come about.

Second, the manner in which the teams were composed was not clear. Most members were selected, some were elected, and a few volunteered. But there was no documentation on who selected whom, who elected whom, or the conditions under which volunteers were accepted. Clearly, considerable thought should have been given to the process, and at a minimum, standard procedures for composing the teams should have been established. The failure to adopt a common method for composing the teams across the 41 schools immediately undercut the capacity to attribute changes in academic process or achievement to the CANAL intervention. It would be impossible to determine whether it was the presence of the core team, the politics and process of generating the core teams, or any number of other outside influences that brought about any observed changes.

Third, Project CANAL staff proceeded with the schedule of proposed activities and training even though the core teams for which the activities were designed did not materialize. What are the implications of the decision to go ahead for the future of CANAL? Will CANAL continue to proceed with teams that predominantly represent teachers and principals? If so, does that represent an adequate model of school-based management? Can the appropriate teams be reconstituted at this point in time? How will they be provided with training equivalent to that received by those who did participate in the first year? What would the implications be of reallocating CANAL resources to make up for the inadequacies of the first year? What options are viable that would allow CANAL to move forward, but recapture to the proposed model for intervention? And perhaps more basic, is it appropriate to proceed as though the

CANAL model is in place when in fact it is not? These questions and others generated by the experience of the first year should be addressed as soon as feasible.

Fourth, given the shortcomings of implementation, what is the potential for generalizing the CANAL model to other schools? It would hardly seem appropriate to attempt replication, given that the original plan was so inadequately implemented and varied so much from one school to another. In addition, variations that were introduced into the training process would confound seriously generalization even if the implementation had been more successful. The point is that it will not be easy to identify which lessons are to be learned from what. Given the variation in the manner in which teams were composed, the constituencies represented on the individual teams, the variation in trainers, and the changes in content from one session to another, it will not be possible to determine which results can be attributed to what. It also means that replication of the experience of the participating CANAL schools in other settings is not possible.

APPENDIX A

BUDGET STATUS

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Project CANAL
First Year

	First Year Budget	Modification	Revised First Yr. Budget	Encumbrance/ Expenses 8/31/89	Balance As of 8/89
Operating Expenses					
Supplies	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 3,000	$2,323	$ 677
Consultant Services	148,000	(33,892)	114,108	113,310	798
Printing	3,000	4,200	7,200	5,516	1,684
Travel	9,000	8,000	17,000	16,583	417
Furniture/Equipment	3,000	21,692	24,692	23,757	935
TOTAL	$166,000	$ - 0 -	$166,000	161,489	$4,511

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

Project CANAL

First Year Budget Detail as of 8/31/89

General Office Supplies		$ 2,323
Consultant Services as of 8/31/89:		
Expended	$109,815	
Encumbered	3,495	
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances		113,310
Printing:		
CANAL Progress Reports		5,516
Travel Expenses:		
Hotel	$ 7,943	
Food	1,700	
Airfare	5,924	
Local	649	
Miscellaneous	367	
Total Travel		16,583
Furniture/Equipment		23,757
Total Operating Expenses		**$161,489**